/Mexamuna, vinginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/066,299	01/31/2002		Mindaugas F. Dautartas	23091/24 (ACT180)	2059
7:	590	04/23/2004		EXAMINER	
Jonathan D Ba			PERALTA, GINETTE		
Edwards & Ang P O Box 9169	gell LLP	,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Boston, MA 02209				2814	
				DATE MAIL ED: 04/23/2007	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		tte i eraita	2014
The MAILING DATE of Period for Reply	f this communication appears o	n the cover sheet with the co	orrespondence address
THE MAILING DATE OF THI  - Extensions of time may be available up after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing.  - If the period for reply specified above in If NO period for reply is specified above.  - Failure to reply within the set or extending.	nder the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In g date of this communication. Is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within tree, the maximum statutory period will apply ded period for reply will, by statute, cause the than three months after the mailing date of the status	no event, however, may a reply be time ne statutory minimum of thirty (30) days and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the he application to become ABANDONED	ely filed  will be considered timely. he mailing date of this communication.  (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> .  3) Since this application is	nication(s) filed on <u>20 January</u> 2b)⊠ This action s in condition for allowance exc with the practice under <i>Ex part</i> e	n is non-final. cept for formal matters, pros	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pe 4a) Of the above claim( 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are a 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rej 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are c	(s) is/are withdrawn from allowed. iected.		
Application Papers			
Applicant may not reques Replacement drawing she	ected to by the Examiner is/are: a) accepted of accepted to by the Examine	g(s) be held in abeyance. See equired if the drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) All b) Some * c) 1. Certified copies of the certification from	de of a claim for foreign priority  None of:  of the priority documents have of the priority documents have rtified copies of the priority doc the International Bureau (PCT d Office action for a list of the	been received. been received in Applicatio cuments have been received Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-8	392)	4) Interview Summary (	PTO-413)

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12 recites "the optical device of claim 29 wherein the substrate and the lid comprise silicon, and the"; the statement is incomplete, this omission rendering the claim indefinite.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacobowitz et al. (U. S. Pat. 5,333,225).

Jacobowitz et al. discloses in Fig. 4 an optical submount comprising a substrate 4, a trench 33 in the substrate 4 for holding an optoelectronic device 19 on-edge; an

electrical connection pit 34 adjoining the trench; a metallization layer in the electrical connection pit (col. 9, ll. 22-25); and an optoelectronic device disposed on-edge in the trench, wherein the optoelectronic device has a contact pad soldered to the metallization layer; wherein there are at least two electrical connection pits 34; and wherein the electrical connection pits are disposed on the same side of the trench; wherein the electrical pit is at least partially filled with solder.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 2-6, 9, 11, 14-19, 21, and 23-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobowitz et al. in view of Sakaino et al. (U. S. Pat. 5,909,523).

Jacobowitz et al. discloses in Fig. 4 an optical submount comprising a substrate 4, a trench 33 in the substrate 4 for holding an optoelectronic device 19 on-edge; an electrical connection pit 34 adjoining the trench; a metallization layer in the electrical connection pit (col. 9, ll. 22-25); and an optoelectronic device disposed on-edge in the trench, wherein the optoelectronic device has a contact pad soldered to the metallization layer; wherein there are at least two electrical connection pits 34; and

wherein the electrical connection pits are disposed on the same side of the trench; wherein the electrical pit is at least partially filled with solder.

Jacobowitz et al. discloses the claimed invention with the exception of a groove in the substrate adjoining the trench, an optical fiber disposed in the groove, and the structure further comprising a lid disposed over the substrate.

Sakaino et al. teaches in Fig. 15 a conventional optical submount that comprises a substrate; a trench in the substrate for holding an optoelectronic device on-edge; a groove in the substrate adjoining the trench; an optical fiber disposed in the groove; wherein the groove is perpendicular to the trench; wherein an optoelectronic device is disposed in the trench; wherein the optoelectronic device includes a contact pad, and the contact pad is soldered to the metallization layer; a lid disposed over the substrate; and the trench does not extend to an edge of the substrate; wherein the groove adjoining the trench is formed for the disclosed intended purpose of providing an area in which to mount a lens of the optoelectronic device; and the lid disposed over the substrate is taught for the disclosed intended purpose of enclosing the structure in a package.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a groove like the one taught by Sakaino et al. and to include in the structure a lid for the disclosed intended purposes of Sakaino et al. of providing an area in which to mount a lens of the optoelectronic device; and enclosing

Jacobowitz et al. further teaches the use of optical fiber in v-groove mounts on the optoelectronic device; that the substrate comprises <100> silicon.

With regards to the limitations of the trench being formed by a dicing saw or by a directional dry etching, and the connection pit being formed by an anisotropical wet etch it is noted that the presence of process limitations on product claims, which product does not otherwise patentably distinguish over prior art, cannot impart patentability to the product. *In re Stephens 145 USPQ 656 (CCPA 1965)*. Thus, as both Jacobowitz et al. and Sakaino et al. show a trench in a substrate, and it is well known in the art that there are several methods of forming a trench, and that these methods result in a trench being formed at a desired location, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any well known process to form the trench without resulting in a patentably distinct structure.

# Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ginette Peralta whose telephone number is (571)272-1713. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 AM- 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (571)272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GP

Weel taking SPE 2814